



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,420	03/26/2004	BuSang Liu	10112.004001	2642
Jonathan P. Osha OSHA NOVAK & MAY L.L.P. Suite 2800 1221 McKinney St. Houston, TX 77010				
EXAMINER VAKILL, ZOHREH				
ART UNIT 1614				
PAPER NUMBER				
MAIL DATE 10/30/2008				
DELIVERY MODE PAPER				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/811,420

Applicant(s)

LIU ET AL.

Examiner

ZOHREH VAKILI

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are REJECTED.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-9 are presented for examination.

Applicant's Amendment filed July 1, 2008 has been received and entered into the present application. Claims 1-9 are pending and are herein examined on the merits.

Applicant's arguments, filed July 1, 2008 have been fully considered. Rejections not reiterated from previous Office Actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set of rejections presently being applied to the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 (New Matter)

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant adds new limitations to the claims that

raise the issue of new matter. New matter issues are raised when Applicant includes limitations in the claims that he/she clearly did not have possession of at the time of invention. The silence of the disclosure regarding the composition is substantially free of retinol, retinal, retinoic acid, and an ester of retinol or retinoic acid is not sufficient to now claim the exclusion of such steps because nowhere in the disclosure has Applicant discussed the composition is substantially free of retinol, retinal, retinoic acid, and an ester of retinol or retinoic acid in the context of the claimed composition.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murad (US Patent No. 6630163 B1), in view of Murad (US Patent 5962517), and further in view of Gildenburg et al. (US Patent No. 6217852 B1).

The instant obviousness rejection was set forth on the grounds that Murad (Pat. No. 6630163 B1) teaches that a transition metal component and/or vitamin E may optionally be induced to assist in inhibiting or reducing inflammation (see col. 13, lines 29-31). Murad further teaches that some nonenzymatic antioxidants, such as Vitamin E (tocopherol), Vitamin A (beta-carotene), and Vitamin C (ascorbic acid) have been individually applied to assist the skin in scavenging free radicals (see col. 1, lines 44-48). The vitamin E component, when included, is typically present in topical

formulations in an amount from about 5 to 40 weight percent, preferably from about 6 to 30 weight percent, and more preferably from about 7 to 20 weight percent of the composition (col. 13, lines 36-40). The vitamin C component, when used, is typically present in the pharmaceutical composition in an amount from about 0.1 to 50 weight percent, preferably from about 5 to 40 weight percent, and more preferably from about 10 to 25 weight percent (see col. 14, lines 51-55). Topical formulations of the composition, however, will typically include the vitamin A component in an amount from about 0.5 to 15 weight percent, preferably from about 1 to 10 weight percent (see col. 14, lines 58-65). Murad further teaches the use of fragrance in an amount of 0.01-1.0 weight percent (see col. 24, line 34). Deionized water is metered into a processing tank and high speed mixing is started (see col. 22, lines 1-2).

Murad (Pat. No. 5962517) in this invention teaches a pharmaceutical composition for the treatment of acne having an acne reduction component in an amount sufficient to reduce the redness and blemishes associated with acne. The invention also relates to pharmaceutical compositions having, in addition to the acne reduction component, a skin cell conditioning component in an amount sufficient to properly regulate the keratin and sebum production of the skin cells, thereby inhibiting the appearance of acne. The composition further includes at least one of a vitamin C source, vitamin B complex, and a vitamin E source. The invention also relates to methods for treating acne by administering, alone or in conjunction with another composition, the pharmaceutical compositions in an amount therapeutically effective in reducing the incidence of acne and methods for additionally inhibiting the appearance of

acne by conditioning skin cells (see abstract). Murad further teaches that the acne reduction component is a vitamin A source, a carotenoid component, a vitamin B₆ source, and a zinc component. In a preferred embodiment, the vitamin A source is present in about 0.005 to 5 weight percent, beta-carotene is present in about 0.1 to 10 weight percent (see col. 4, lines 56-65). The vitamin C source is calcium ascorbate present in about 1 to 30 weight percent (see col. 4, lines 18-19). The vitamin E source is present in about 1 to 30 weight percent (see col. 4, lines 29-30). Vitamin B complexes enhance the effectiveness of vitamin B₆ in treating the skin. Vitamin B complexes may be found in the present pharmaceutical composition in about 0.05 to 15 weight percent, preferably about 0.2 to 5 weight percent, and more preferably about 0.3 to 3 weight percent (see col. 8, lines 13-19).

Gildenberg et al. teaches a composition for use as a sunscreen applied during washing (see abstract). Preferred carriers for inclusions with compositions of the present invention include one or more surfactants (see col. 11, lines 29-30). Preferred surfactants include any one of a great variety of nonionic, cationic, anionic, and zwitterionic emulsifiers (see col. 11, lines 39-41). Generally, suitable surfactant types include esters of glycerin, esters of propylene glycol, fatty acid esters of polyethylene glycol, carboxylic acid copolymers (see col. 11, lines 44-48). Gildenberg et al. further teaches the surfactant may be used individually or as a mixture of two or more. Regardless of the number selected the surfactant preferably comprise from about 0.1 percent to 40 percent, preferably from about 1.0 percent to about 20 percent, and most preferably from about 1.0 percent to about 10.0 percent of the composition of the

present invention (see col. 12, lines 11-16). The composition of the present invention comprises from about 5.0 percent to about 95.0 percent, more preferably from about 10.0 percent to about 80.0 percent, and most preferably from about 30.0 percent to about 60.0 percent of purified water, according to the American Heritage Dictionary distilled water is purified or refined by distillation. The exact level of water will depend upon the form of the product and the desired moisture content (see col. 12, lines 31-37). Thickening agents or gellants may be added as desired to adjust the texture and viscosity of the composition. Such agents or gallants may be selected from Carbopol® resins and Pemulen® (see col. 13, lines 7-14). Optionally, various vitamins may be included in the composition of the present invention. Examples include vitamin A, vitamin C, vitamin B, and vitamin E (see col. 13, lines 15-23).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the teachings of Murad (Pat. No. 6630163 B1) taken with Murad (Pat. No. 5962517) and combined with the teachings of Gildenberg et al. All three references teach that these components, Vitamin E, Vitamin C, carotene, Vitamin B complex are used in combination for topical administration. The motivation to combine the references is because Murad teaches nonenzymatic antioxidants such as Vitamin E (tocopherol), Vitamin A (beta-carotene), and Vitamin C (ascorbic acid) have been individually applied to assist the skin in scavenging free radicals and neutralizing the harmful effects of UV light. Further Murad (Patent No. 5962517) relates to pharmaceutical compositions for treating acne and conditioning the skin cells by using vitamin C, vitamin B complex, vitamin E, and beta carotene. Gildenberg et al. introduces additional components such as surfactants,

thickening agents, and inclusion of vitamin C, vitamin B, vitamin A and vitamin E in the composition of the invention.

The ranges of these ingredients are within the concentration range as presently claimed in the invention. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the teachings of Murad (Pat. No. 6630163 B1 and Pat. No. 5962517), Gildenberg et al., to modify the concentration ranges to come up with a composition for skin product to help shield the skin and to provide acne treatment.

Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made would have been motivated to use the teachings of the prior arts cited above about the use and making of a composition for skin care as claimed in the present invention.

In the absence of any criticality/unexpected results presently claimed invention is considered *prima facie* obvious over the prior arts for the reasons cited above.

Response to Argument

Applicant has amended the claims to recite retinol, retinal, and retinoic acid, instead of vitamin A and vitamin A acid. Applicant include such a limitation, wherein the composition is substantially free of retinol, retinal, retinoic acid, and an ester of retinol or retinoic acid. Applicant adds new limitations to the claims that raise the issue of new matter. Applicant includes limitations in the claims that he/she clearly did not have possession of at the time of invention. Applicant argues that Murad (Pat. No. '163) does not teach a composition substantially free of vitamin A nor teaches a composition

comprising carotene. Examiner does not agree with the argument. Murad (Pat. No. '163) teaches a composition that contains a source of Vitamin A which is derived from beta-carotene. Thus the composition of Murad does contain beta-carotene. Applicant's attention is directed to col. 1, lines 44-48. Further more, Murad in Pat No. 5962517 teaches beta-carotene is present in the composition in about 0.1 to 10 weight percent (see col. 4, lines 56-65). Further Applicant claims that the composition is substantially free of Vitamin A or Vitamin A acid. However, if a composition contains carotene this composition is not substantially free of Vitamin A or its derivatives, because carotene is a precursor of Vitamin A, therefore, the composition is not substantially free of Vitamin A or its derivatives. Applicant further discusses that the instant claims are topical compositions to be used on the skins and they will not encounter the necessary enzymes to convert carotene into vitamin A. Applicant's attention is drawn to Murad (Pat. No. 6630163 B1) which teaches a topical formulation which contains Vitamin A (beta-carotene). Applicant also discusses each reference separately and not combined with each other. Applicant in his remarks argues that the specific compositions as claimed are not specifically shown and the presence of an ingredient in one patent with other ingredients in another patent does not make a new distinctive combination, even if some of the same ingredients are used, obvious. Applicant is reminded that the obviousness rejection is not an anticipation rejection. Murad clearly teaches in both patents all the components of the claimed invention in a composition with the exception of using surfactant, thickening agent, and distilled water which are taught by Gildenberg et al. In obviousness rejection a combination of references is used, and the references

are relied upon in combination and are not meant to be considered separately as in a vacuum. It is the combination of all of the cited and relied upon references that make up the state of the art with regard to the claimed invention. Applicant's claimed invention fails to patentably distinguish over the state of the art represented by the combination of the cited references. *In re Young*, 403 F.2d 754, 159 USPQ 725 (CCPA 1968); *In re Keller* 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Moreover, it is noted that rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are based on combinations of references, where the secondary references are cited to reconcile the deficiencies of the primary reference with the knowledge generally available to one ordinary skill in the art to show that the differences between Applicant's invention and the prior art are such that they would have been modifications that were *prima facie* obvious to the skilled artisan. It is noted that the claimed invention is not required to be expressly suggested in its entirety by any one or all of the references cited under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Applicant's amendments and remarks have been carefully considered in their entirety, but fail to be persuasive in establishing error in the propriety of the present rejection.

For these reasons, and those already made of record at pages 3-9 of the previous Office Action dated April 2, 2008 of which such reasons are incorporated herein by reference, rejection of claims 1-9 remain proper and is **maintained**.

Conclusion

No claims of the present application are allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zohreh Vakili whose telephone number is 571-272-3099. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 Mon.-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on 571-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Zohreh Vakili

Patent Examiner 1614

October 22, 2008

/Ardin Marschel/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1614